

access the resource of the second protected server without first logging in. *See Sampson, Abstract.*

Farber is directed to a network in which resources of an originating server can be rewritten to repeaters to help improve the speed of delivering content for those resources to a client. Reflectors intercept resource requests from the client, identify a best repeater and redirect the client to that repeater. *See, e.g., Farber, Abstract.*

Claim 1 is directed to a method for locating a resource and recites the following acts:

1. providing an interface having instructions to send association data;
2. identifying an identity service using the association data, the identity service managing resource data; and
3. locating the resource using the resource data.

Rejecting Claim 1, The Examiner admits that Sampson "fails to teach identifying an identity service using the association data, the identity service managing resource data; and locating the resource." Instead, the Examiner asserts that these acts are taught by Farber. For support, the Examiner cites Farber, para's [0104] – [0106].

The cited passage is reproduced as follows:

[0104] If the request is not for a resource from a known subscriber, the request is rejected. To reject a request, the repeater returns a reply indicating that the requested resource does not exist.

[0105] C3. The repeater then determines whether the requested resource is cached locally. If the requested resource is in the repeater's cache it is retrieved. On the other hand, if a valid copy of the requested resource is not in the repeater's cache, the repeater modifies the incoming URL, creating a request that it issues directly to the originating reflector which processes it (as in B1-B6). Because this request to the originating reflector is from a repeater, the reflector always returns the requested resource rather than reflecting the request (Recall that reflectors always handle requests from repeaters locally.) If the repeater obtained the

resource from the origin server, the repeater then caches the resource locally.

[0106] If a resource is not cached locally, the cache can query its "peer caches" to see if one of them contains the resource, before or at the same time as requesting the resource from the reflector/origin server. If a peer cache responds positively in a limited period of time (preferably a small fraction of a second), the resource will be retrieved from the peer cache.

Nothing in the cited passage even hints at using association data to identify an identity service that manages resource data. Further, nothing in the cited passage even hints at locating the resource using the resource data. The cited passage merely describes a method in which a repeater determines if its cache contains a requested resource. If it does, the repeater retrieves the resource from its cache. Otherwise the repeater modifies an incoming URL to create a request it issues back to an originating repeater which then returns the resource to the repeater so that it can be stored in the cache. A repeater's cache can also query peer caches of other repeaters to retrieve the resource if available.

Nothing in the cited passage mentions the use of association data or an identity service that manages resource data. Consequently, Farber does not teach using association data to identify such an identity service and then locating a resource using resource data managed by that identity service. For at least these reasons, Claim 1 is patentable over the cited references as are Claims 2-4 which depend from Claim 1. Should the Examiner persist, the Applicants respectfully ask that the Examiner specifically identify the component of Farber's system that is equivalent to the identity service recited in Claim 1.

Claim 5 is directed to a method for locating a resource for a user and recites the following acts:

1. providing an interface having instructions to send association data to two or more association services;

2. identifying from the two or more association services, an association service with which the user has established a relationship;
3. identifying an identity service using the association data sent to the identified association service, the identity service managing resource data; and
4. locating the resource using the resource data.

Again, the Examiner admits that Sampson "fails to teach identifying an identity service using the association data, the identity service managing resource data; and locating the resource." The Examiner once again mistakenly asserts that these acts are taught by Farber citing Farber, para's [0104] – [0106] reproduced above.

For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable over the cited references, so is Claim 5.

Claim 7 is directed to a method for producing an electronic document and recites the following acts:

1. generating, upon request from a user, a web page having content for requesting a web bug from an association service as well as content for displaying controls for selecting production options;
2. querying the association service to identify an identity service with which the user is registered providing an URL for the generated web page;
3. obtaining the user's resource data from the identified identity service;
4. locating and accessing a document management service using the resource data;
5. providing additional content for the web page for displaying controls for selecting a document managed by the document management service; and
6. producing a document according to selections made through the web page.

The Examiner asserts that the first three acts of Claim 7 are taught by Sampson, col. 10, lines 40-45 which are reproduced as follows:

Session management in the system 400 is carried out with respect to sessions between clients such as client 100 and servers such as Protected Server 104, 112. Each session between a client and a server is represented by a set of session information. The session information preferably comprises: an initial session identifier value; an initial access time value; a last access time value; a user identifier value or key; a general timeout value; and an idle timeout value.

Sampson, col. 10, lines 39-46. Nothing in the cited passage or elsewhere in Sampson even hints at the use of a web bug let alone an interface having instructions for requesting a web bug. With respect to Claims 1 and 5 the Examiner admits that Sampson does not teach identifying an identity service using association data. But with respect to Claim 7, the Examiner mysteriously asserts that Sampson somehow teaches identifying an identity service with which the user is registered by providing an association service with association data in the form of an URL for a generated web page.

A cursory review of the cited passage and a more thorough review of the remainder of Sampson reveals that the Examiner is mistaken with respect to Claim 7 and correct with respect to Claims 1 and 5. Nothing in Sampson hints at querying an association service to identify an identity service with which the user is registered providing an URL for the generated web page and then obtaining the user's resource data from the identified identity service.

Continuing, the Examiner admits that Sampson fails to teach "locating and accessing a document management service using the resource data; providing additional content for the web page for displaying controls for selecting a document managed by the document management service; and producing a document according to selections made through the web page." Instead, the Examiner relies on Farber, citing Farber "page 6, paragraph [0014-0016]." Farber page 6, contains paragraphs [0095 – 0115]. Paragraphs [0014-0016] span pages 1 and 2 and include portions of the background and summary sections. Paragraphs [0014 – 0016] are reproduced as follows:

[0014] Proxy caches depend on cache control hints delivered with resources to determine when the resources should be replaced. These

hints are predictive, and are necessarily often incorrect, so proxy caches frequently serve stale data. In many cases, proxy cache operators instruct their proxy to ignore hints in order to make the cache more efficient, even though this causes it to more frequently serve stale data.

[0015] Proxy caches hide the activity of clients from publishers. Once a resource is cached, the publisher has no way of knowing how often it was accessed from the cache.

SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

[0016] This invention provides a way for servers in a computer network to off-load heir processing of requests for selected resources by determining a different server (a "repeater") to process those requests. The selection of the repeater can be made dynamically, based on information about possible repeaters.

Nothing in this passage (or paragraphs [0104 – 0106]) is even remotely related to locating and accessing a document management service using the resource data, providing additional content for the web page for displaying controls for selecting a document managed by the document management service, and producing a document according to selections made through the web page. Should the Examiner persist, the applicants request that the Examiner clearly reference those portions of Farber that teach or suggest these limitations.

For at least these reasons, Claim 7 is patentable over the cited references as is Claim 8 which depends from Claim 7.

Claim 9 is directed to a computer readable medium having instructions for implementing the method of **Claim 1**. For at least the same reasons **Claim 1** is patentable, so are **Claim 9** and **Claims 10-12** which depend from **Claim 9**.

Claim 13 is directed to a computer readable medium having instructions for implementing the method of **Claim 5**. The Examiner provides no explanation or support for the rejection of **Claim 13**. As such, the rejection cannot stand. Nonetheless, for at least the same reasons **Claim 5** is patentable, so is **Claim 13**.

Claim 14 is direct to is directed to a computer readable medium having instructions for implementing the method of **Claim 6**. The Examiner provides no explanation or support for the rejection of **Claim 14**. As such, the rejection cannot stand. Nonetheless, for at least the same reasons **Claim 6** is patentable, so is **Claim 14**.

Claim 15 is direct to a computer readable medium having instructions for implementing the method of **Claim 7**. The Examiner provides no explanation or support for the rejection of **Claim 15**. As such, the rejection cannot stand. Nonetheless, for at least the same reasons **Claim 7** is patentable, so are **Claim 15** and **Claim 16** which depends from **Claim 15**.

Claim 17 is direct to a system for locating a resource, and recites the following elements:

1. an association module operable to query an association service, supplying a session identifier, in order to identify an identity service managing resource data; and
2. an application operable to:
 - a. provide an interface having instructions to send association data to the association service, the association data to contain a client identifier and a session identifier for the provided interface;
 - b. acquire resource data from an identity service identified by a query from the association module; and
 - c. locate the resource using the resource data.

The Examiner provides no explanation or support for the rejection of **Claim 17**. As such the Applicants have not been afforded a fair opportunity to respond to the rejection of **Claim 17** or **Claim 18** which depends from **Claim 17**. Should the Examiner

persist, the Applicants request that the Examiner provide detailed support for the rejection of Claims 17 and 18.

Claim 19 is directed to a document production system and recites the following elements:

1. an association module operable to query an association service, supplying a session identifier in order to identify an identity service managing resource data; and
2. a document production application operable to:
 - a. provide an interface having content for sending association data containing a session identifier for the provided interface to an association service as well as content for displaying controls for selecting production options;
 - b. acquire resource data from an identity service identifier identified by a query from the association module;
 - c. locate and access a document management service using the resource data; and
 - d. provide, for the interface, additional content for displaying controls for selecting a document managed by the document management service; and
 - e. produce a document according to selections made through the interface.

Rejecting Claim 19, the Examiner provides no support for the assertion that Sampson teaches "a document production system, comprising: an association module operable to query an association service, supplying a session identifier in order to identify an identity service managing resource data; and a document production application operable to: provide an interface: having content for sending association data containing a session identifier for the provided interface to an association service as

well as content for displaying controls for selecting production options."

Consequently, the rejection of Claim 19 cannot stand

Nonetheless, referring back to Claim 7, the Examiner mysteriously asserted that Sampson somehow teaches identifying an identity service with which the user is registered by providing an association service with association data in the form of an URL for a generated web page. Similar to Claim 7, Claim 19 requires an association module operable to query an association service, supplying a session identifier in order to identify an identity service managing resource data. As with Claim 7, nothing in Sampson hints at an association service operable to identify an identity service using an URL or other association data.

Continuing, the Examiner admits that Sampson fails to teach a document production application operable to "acquire resource data from an identity service identifier identified by a query from the association module; locate and access a document management service using the resource data; and provide, for the interface, additional content for displaying controls for selecting a document managed by the document management service; and produce a document according to selections made through the interface." Instead, the Examiner relies on Farber, citing Farber page 6, paragraphs [0014-0016]. Farber page 6, contains paragraphs [0095 – 0115]. Paragraphs [0014-0016] span pages 1 and 2 and include portions of the background and summary sections. Paragraphs [0014 – 0016] are reproduced above.

Nothing in the cited passage (or paragraphs [0104 – 0106]) is even remotely related to an application that is operable to acquire resource data from an identity service identifier identified by a query from the association module, locate and access a document management service using the resource data, provide, for the interface, additional content for displaying controls for selecting a document managed by the document management service, and produce a document according to selections made through the interface.

Should the Examiner persist, the applicants request that the Examiner clearly reference those portions of Farber that teach or suggest these limitations. For at least these reasons, Claim 19 is patentable over the cited references.

Claim 20 is directed to a system for locating a resource and recites the following elements:

1. an identity service operable to manage resource data;
2. an association server operable to receive association data containing a client identifier and a session identifier, save the association data in an association table, and receive queries for the association table;
3. an association table interface in communication with the association server and operable, according to a received query, to access from the association table a session identifier for the identity service using a session identifier supplied with the query;
4. an association module operable to query, supplying a session identifier, the association service in order to identify the identity service;
5. an application operable to:
 - a. provide an interface having instructions to send association data to an association server, the association data to contain a client identifier and a session identifier for the provided interface;
 - b. acquire resource data from the identity service identified by a query from the association module; and
 - c. locate the resource using the resource data.

The Examiner asserts that the first four elements of Claim 20 are taught by Sampson, col. 10, lines 40-45 and col. 9, lines 52-67 which are reproduced as follows:

Session management in the system 400 is carried out with respect to sessions between clients such as client 100 and servers such as Protected Server 104, 112. Each session between a client and a server is represented by a set of session information. The session information preferably comprises: an initial session identifier value; an initial access time value; a last access time value; a user identifier value or key; a general timeout value; and an idle timeout value.

Sampson, col. 10, lines 39-46.

Database 450 maintains a list of sessions. All Session Managers 420A, 420B know the list of sessions. In one implementation, the list is kept in memory, and any change to a session is broadcast to all Session Managers. Alternatively, the list of sessions may be maintained in a database table. Database replication may be used to provide redundancy. Each Session Manager may be located in the same computer as the computer that hosts the database.

A Logging Service 430 may be coupled to each of the Session Managers 420A, 420B. The Logging Service 430 receives information about the actions taken by the Session Managers and records such information in one or more logs. If a session is removed from memory, an administrator can determine what happened to the session information by reviewed the logs. Preferably, Logging Service 430 is called to log exceptions; session creation; session revocation; session revocation by administrator; and session revocation due to idle timeout. Each log comprises a plurality of records. Each log record includes a session identifier and information identifying the client that caused the logged event.

Sampson, col. 9, line 52 through col. 10, line 4.

With respect to Claims 1 and 5 the Examiner admits that Sampson does not teach identifying an identity service using association data. With respect to Claim 20, the Examiner mysteriously asserts that Sampson somehow teaches an association module operable to query, supplying a session identifier, the association service in order to identify the identity service. A cursory review of the cited passages and a more thorough review of the remainder of Sampson reveals that the Examiner is mistaken with respect to Claim 20 and correct with respect to Claims 1 and 5. Noting in Sampson hints at an association module operable to query, supplying a session identifier, the association service in order to identify the identity service.

Continuing, the Examiner admits that Sampson fails to teach an application that is operable to "acquire resource data from the identity service identified by a query from the association module; and locate the resource using the resource data." Instead, the Examiner relies on Farber, citing Farber "page 6, paragraph [0104-0106]." That passage is reproduced above with the discussion of Claim 1. Nothing in the cited passage even hints at an application that is operable to acquire resource data from the identity service identified by a query from the association module. Further,

nothing in the cited passage even hints at locating the resource using the resource data. The cited passage merely describes a method in which a repeater determines if its cache contains a requested resource. If it does, the repeater retrieves the resource from its cache. Otherwise the repeater modifies an incoming URL to create a request it issues back to an originating repeater which then contains and returns the resource to the repeater so that it can be stored in the cache. A repeater's cache can also query peer caches of other repeaters to retrieve the resource.

For at least these reasons, Claim 20 is patentable over the cited references as is Claim 21 which depends from Claim 20.

Claim 22 is directed to a document production system and recites the following elements:

1. a document management service;
2. an identity service operable to manage resource data for locating and accessing the document management service;
3. an association server operable to receive association data containing a client identifier and a session identifier, save the association data in an association table, and receive queries for the association table;
4. an association table interface in communication with the association server and operable, according to a received query, to access from the association table a session identifier for the identity service using the session identifier supplied with the query;
5. an association module operable to query, supplying a session identifier, the association service in order to identify the identity service;
6. a document production application operable to:
 - a. provide an interface having content for sending association data containing a client identifier and a session identifier for the provided interface to an association service as well as content for displaying controls for selecting production options;

- b. acquire resource data from an identity service using the session identifier for the identity service identified by a query from the association module;
- c. locate and access the document management service using the resource data;
- d. provide, for the interface, additional content for displaying controls for selecting a document managed by the document management service; and
- e. produce a document according to selections made through the interface.

The Examiner bundles the explanation for the rejection of Claim 22 with the explanation of Claim 20. That explanation fails to address specific elements of Claim 22 which are different than the elements of Claim 20. For at least this reason, the rejection of Claim 22 cannot stand. Furthermore, the system of Claim 22 recites elements for implementing the method of Claim 7. For at least the same reasons Claim 7 is patentable so are Claim 22 and Claim 23 which depends from Claim 22.

Claim 24 is directed to a system for implementing the method of Claim 1. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so is Claim 24.

Claim 25 is directed to a system for implementing the method of Claim 7. For at least the same reasons Claim 7 is patentable, so is Claim 25.

Conclusion: In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing the application to issue is earnestly solicited. The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory Eugene Perkins, et al.

By 
Jack H. McKinney
Reg. No. 45,685

July 20, 2005